

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-8 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1, 6 and 7 have been amended. Basis for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings as originally filed.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claim 6 has been amended to depend from Claim 5 which provides the antecedent basis for "said bolt". Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Groves, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,325,942). Claim 1 has been amended to define the intake valve as directly engaging the cylinder end. In addition, the disc spring has been defined as having an outer circumferential edge biased against only the intake valve.

In Groves, et al. the intake valve 130 is not in direct engagement with the cylinder end 138. Disc springs 144-152 are disposed between these two elements. In addition, the outer circumferential edge of discs 144-152 do not have a circumferential edge that is biased against the intake valve 130. The outer circumferential edge of disc 144 extends beyond the edge of intake valve 130 and thus it is not biased against intake

valve 130. Also, the valve discs 144-152 are biased between intake valve 130 and cylinder end 138 and thus are not biased against only the intake valve 130.

Thus, Applicant believes Claim 1, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 2-4 which ultimately depend from Claim 1 are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Groves, et al. in view of Yoshimura, et al. (JP 06002731 A). Claims 5-8 ultimately depend from Claim 1. As stated above, Claim 1 has been amended and is now believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Thus, Claims 5-8 are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### **CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the

Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 25, 2004

By. 

Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg